

### **REMARKS**

Claim 1 stands rejected under § 102 on the basis of Lim et al. '086. Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the invention over the cited reference, and applicants traverse because Lim does not disclose (or suggest) an intermediate electrode that is divided into two or more areas in each pixel, as in amended claim 1.

The examiner asserts that Lim discloses in Figs. 5e-5g the structure of an “intermediate electrode (opposite electrode) divided into two or more sections, each of the sections being electrically connected to the pixel electrode via a contact hole”, quoting the present claim 1. However, in Lim, the intermediate electrode is not divided in two or more areas in each pixel, and therefore, the structure that each of the divided areas is connected to the pixel electrode cannot be derived from Lim. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6 stand rejected under § 103 on the basis of Lim '086 and Kitakado '902. Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 2-5 for the reasons given with respect to independent claim 1. Applicants traverse the rejection of claim 6 because the references do not disclose or suggest, alone or in combination, a connection line that connects the opposite electrode of the present invention and the source electrode of the TFT in the same layer, as in independent claim 6.

The examiner asserts that, in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5g of Lim, one of the divided sections of the intermediate electrode is connected via connection line 136 to the drain 119 of the TFT located in the same layer, which arrangement is regarded by the examiner as being

equivalent to a feature of claim 6, that is, "a connection located in the same layer as the source electrode and the intermediate (opposite) electrode and extending between the source electrode and the opposite electrode". However, the connection line 136 of Lim is used to connect the gate line 104 (which is regarded by the examiner as being equivalent to the auxiliary electrode of the present invention) to the upper-layer first capacitance electrode (which is regarded by the examiner as being equivalent to the intermediate (or opposite) electrode of the present invention) via a contact 127. See, col. 6, lines 30-35. Thus, the connection line 136 of Lim does not connect an intermediate electrode and a source electrode of a TFT that are located in the same layer. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-6 is respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Patrick G. Burns  
Registration No. 29,367

September 6, 2005

300 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312.360.0080  
Facsimile: 312.360.9315  
Customer No. 24978